arXiv:1404.5432v2 [cs.DM] 7 May 2014

Win-Win Kernelization for Degree Sequence Completion Problems

Vincent Froese*, André Nichterlein, and Rolf Niedermeier

Institut für Softwaretechnik und Theoretische Informatik, TU Berlin, Germany,
{vincent.froese, andre.nichterlein, rolf.niedermeier}@tu-berlin.de

Abstract

We study the accessibility to provably effective and efficient data reduction of a class of NP-hard graph modification problems based on vertex degree properties. Our main positive results refer to NP-hard graph completion (that is, edge addition) cases while we show that there is no hope to achieve analogous results for the corresponding vertex or edge deletion versions. Our algorithms are based on a method that transforms graph completion problems into efficiently solvable number problems and exploits f-factor computations for translating the results back into the graph setting. Indeed, our core observation is that we encounter a win-win situation in the sense that either the number of edge additions is small (and thus faster to find) or the problem is polynomial-time solvable. This approach helps in answering an open question by Mathieson and Szeider [*JCSS* 2012] concerning the so-called polynomial kernelizability of Degree Constraint Edge Addition and leads to a general method of approaching polynomial-time preprocessing for a wider class of degree sequence completion problems.

1 Introduction

We propose a general approach for achieving polynomial-size problem kernels for a class of graph completion problems where the goal graph has to fulfill certain degree properties. Thus, we explore and enlarge results on provably effective polynomial-time preprocessing for these NP-hard graph problems. To a large extent, the initial motivation for our work comes from studying the NP-hard graph modification problem Degree Constraint Editing(S) for

*Supported by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, project DAMM (NI 369/13).

To appear in *Proceedings of the 14th Scandinavian Symposium and Workshops on Algorithm Theory (SWAT' 14), Copenhagen, Denmark, July 2014.* © *Springer.*

non-empty subsets $S \subseteq \{v^-, e^+, e^-\}$ of editing operations (v^-: "vertex deletion", e^+: "edge addition", e^-: "edge deletion") as introduced by Mathieson and Szeider [32].[1] The definition reads as follows.

DEGREE CONSTRAINT EDITING(S) (DCE(S))
Input: An undirected graph $G = (V, E)$, two integers $k, r > 0$, and a "degree list function" $\tau\colon V \to 2^{\{0,\ldots,r\}}$.
Question: Is it possible to obtain a graph $G' = (V', E')$ from G using at most k editing operations of type(s) as specified by S such that $\deg_{G'}(v) \in \tau(v)$ for all $v \in V'$?

In our work, the set S always consists of a single editing operation. Our studies focus on the two most natural parameters: the number k of editing operations and the maximum allowed degree r. We will show that, although all three variants are NP-hard, DCE(e^+) is amenable to a generic kernelization method we propose. This method is based on dynamic programming solving a corresponding number problem and f-factor computations. For DCE(e^-) and DCE(v^-), however, we show that there is little hope to achieve analogous results.

Previous Work There are basically two fundamental starting points for our work. First, there is our previous theoretical work on degree anonymization[2] in social networks [24] motivated and strongly inspired by a preceding heuristic approach due to Clarkson et al. [11]. Indeed, our previous work for degree anonymization very recently inspired empirical work with encouraging experimental results [25]. A fundamental contribution of this work now is to systematically reveal what the problem-specific parts (tailored towards degree anonymization) and what the "general" parts of that approach are. In this way, we develop this approach into a general method of wider applicability for a large number of graph completion problems based on degree properties. The second fundamental starting point is Mathieson and Szeider's work [32] on DCE(S). They showed several parameterized preprocessing (also known as kernelization) results and left open whether it is possible to reduce DCE(e^+) in polynomial time to a problem kernel of size polynomial in r—we will affirmatively answer this question. Indeed, while Mathieson and Szeider provided several fixed-parameter tractability results with respect to the combined parameter k and r, they partially left open whether similar

[1] Mathieson and Szeider [32] originally introduced a weighted version of the problem, where the vertices and edges can have positive integer weights incurring a cost for each editing operation. Here, we focus on the unweighted version.

[2] For a given integer k, the task here is to add as few edges as possible to a graph such that the resulting graph is k-*anonymous*, that is, there is no vertex degree in the graph which occurs at least one but less than k times.

results can be achieved using the stronger parameterization[3] with the single parameter r. Very recently, Golovach [20] described a number of kernelization results for closely related graph editing problems; his methods, however, significantly differ from ours.

From a more general perspective, all these considerations fall into the category of "graph editing to fulfill degree constraints", which recently received increased interest in terms of parameterized complexity analysis [7, 17, 20, 33].

Our Contributions. Answering an open question of Mathieson and Szeider [32], we present an $O(kr^2)$-vertex kernel for DCE(e^+) which we then transfer into an $O(r^5)$-vertex kernel using a strategy rooted in previous work [11, 24]. A further main contribution of our work in the spirit of meta kernelization [2] is to clearly separate problem-specific from problem-independent aspects of this strategy, thus making it accessible to a wider class of degree sequence completion problems. We observe that if the goal graph shall have "small" maximum degree r, then the actual graph structure is in a sense negligible and thus allows for a lot of freedom that can be algorithmically exploited. This paves the way to a *win-win situation* of either having guaranteed a small number of edge additions or the overall problem being solvable in polynomial-time anyway—another example in the list of win-win situations exploited in parameterized algorithmics [16].

Besides our positive kernelization results, we exclude polynomial-size problem kernels for DCE(e^-) and DCE(v^-) subject to the assumption that NP $\not\subseteq$ coNP/poly, thereby showing that the exponential-size kernel results by Mathieson and Szeider [32] are essentially tight. In other words, this demonstrates that in our context edge completion is much more amenable to kernelization than edge deletion or vertex deletion are. We also prove NP-hardness of DCE(v^-) and DCE(e^+) for graphs of maximum degree three, implying that the maximum degree is not a useful parameter for parameterized complexity or kernelization purposes. Last but not least, we develop a general preprocessing approach for Degree Sequence Completion problems which yields a search space size that is polynomially bounded in the parameter. While this per se does not give polynomial kernels, we derive fixed-parameter tractability with respect to the combined parameter maximum degree and solution size. The usefulness of our method is illustrated by further example degree sequence completion problems.

Notation. All graphs in this paper are undirected, loopless, and simple (that is, without multiple edges). For a graph $G = (V, E)$, we set $n := |V|$ and $m := |E|$. The degree of a vertex $v \in V$ is denoted by $\deg_G(v)$, the

[3]Fixed-parameter tractability with respect to the parameter r (trivially) implies fixed-parameter tractability with respect to the combined parameter (k, r), but the reverse clearly does not hold in general; see Komusiewicz and Niedermeier [28] for a broader discussion in this direction.

maximum vertex degree by Δ_G, and the *minimum vertex degree* by δ_G. For a finite set U, we denote with $\binom{U}{2}$ the set of all size-two subsets of U. We denote by $\overline{G} := (V, \binom{V}{2} \setminus E)$ the *complement graph* of G. For a vertex subset $V' \subseteq V$, the subgraph induced by V' is denoted by $G[V']$. For an edge subset $E' \subseteq \binom{V}{2}$, $V(E')$ denotes the set of all endpoints of edges in E' and $G[E'] := (V(E'), E')$. For a set E' of edges with endpoints in a graph G, we denote by $G + E' := (V, E \cup E')$ the graph that results by inserting all edges in E' into G. Similarly, we define for a vertex set $V' \subseteq V$, the graph $G - V' := G[V \setminus V']$. For each vertex $v \in V$, we denote by $N_G(v)$ the *open neighborhood* of v in G and by $N_G[v] := N_G(v) \cup \{v\}$ the *closed neighborhood*. The i^{th}*-neighborhood* is $N_G^i[v] := \{u \in V \mid u \in N_G[N_G^{i-1}[v]]\}$ with $N_G^1[v] := N_G[v]$ and for $i \geq 2$: $N_G^i(v) := N_G^i[v] \setminus N_G^{i-1}(v)$. Correspondingly, for a vertex subset $V' \subseteq V$ we set $N_G^i[V'] = \bigcup_{v \in V'} N_G^i[v]$ and $N_G^i(V') = N_G^i[V'] \setminus N_G^{i-1}[V']$. Again, we abbreviate $N_G^1[V']$ ($N_G^1(V')$) with $N_G[V']$ ($N_G(V')$ respectively). We omit subscripts if the corresponding graph is clear from the context. A vertex $v \in V$ with $\deg(v) \in \tau(v)$ is called *satisfied* (otherwise *unsatisfied*). We denote by $U \subseteq V$ the set of all unsatisfied vertices, formally $U := \{v \in V \mid \deg_G(v) \notin \tau(v)\}$.

Parameterized Complexity. This is a two-dimensional framework for studying computational complexity [13, 18, 35]. One dimension of a parameterized problem is the input size s, and the other one is the *parameter* (usually a positive integer). A parameterized problem is called *fixed-parameter tractable* (fpt) with respect to a parameter ℓ if it can be solved in $f(\ell) \cdot s^{O(1)}$ time, where f is a computable function only depending on ℓ. This definition also extends to *combined parameters*. Here, the parameter usually consists of a tuple of positive integers $(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ldots)$ and a parameterized problem is called fpt with respect to $(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ldots)$ if it can be solved in $f(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ldots) \cdot s^{O(1)}$ time.

A core tool in the development of fixed-parameter algorithms is polynomial-time preprocessing by *data reduction* [1, 21, 29]. Here, the goal is to transform a given problem instance I with parameter ℓ in polynomial time into an equivalent instance I' with parameter $\ell' \leq \ell$ such that the size of I' is upper-bounded by some function g only depending on ℓ. If this is the case, we call I' a (problem) *kernel* of size $g(\ell)$. If g is a polynomial, then we speak of a *polynomial kernel*. Usually, this is achieved by applying polynomial-time executable data reduction rules. We call a data reduction rule $\mathcal{R}$ *correct* if the new instance I' that results from applying $\mathcal{R}$ to I is a yes-instance if and only if I is a yes-instance. The whole process is called *kernelization*. It is well known that a parameterized problem is fixed-parameter tractable if and only if it has a problem kernel.

2 Degree Constraint Editing

Mathieson and Szeider [32] showed fixed-parameter tractability of DCE(S)

for all non-empty subsets $S \subseteq \{v^-, e^-, e^+\}$ with respect to the combined parameter (k, r) and W[1]-hardness with respect to the single parameter k. The fixed-parameter tractability is in a sense tight as Cornuéjols [12] proved that DCE(e^-) is NP-hard on planar graphs with maximum degree three and with maximum allowed degree $r = 3$ and thus presumably not fixed-parameter tractable with respect to r. We complement his result by showing that DCE(v^-) is NP-hard on cubic (that is three-regular) planar graphs, even if $r = 0$, and that DCE(e^+) is NP-hard on graphs with maximum degree three.

Theorem 1. DCE(v^-) *is NP-hard on cubic planar graphs, even if* $r = 0$.

Proof. We provide a polynomial-time many-one reduction from the NP-hard Vertex Cover on cubic planar graphs [19]. Given a cubic graph $G = (V, E)$ and a positive integer h, the Vertex Cover problem asks for a subset V' of at most h vertices such that each edge in E has at least one endpoint in V'. Let $I = (G = (V, E), h)$ be a Vertex Cover instance with the cubic planar graph G. Now consider the DCE(v^-) instance $I' = (G, h, 0, \tau)$ with $\tau(v) = \{0\}$ for all $v \in V$. Observe that I and I' are a yes-instances if and only if at most h vertices can be removed from G such that the resulting graph is edgeless. Hence, I is a yes-instance if and only if I' is a yes-instance. □

Theorem 2. DCE(e^+) *is NP-hard on planar graphs with maximum degree three.*

Proof. We provide a polynomial-time many-one reduction from the NP-hard Independent Set problem on cubic planar graphs [19]. Given a cubic graph $G = (V, E)$ and a positive integer h, the Independent Set problem asks for a subset V' of at least h pairwise non-adjacent vertices. Given an Independent Set instance $(G = (V, E), h)$, we construct a DCE(e^+) instance (G', k, h, τ) as follows: Start with G' as a copy of G, add a new vertex v to G' and set $\tau(v) := \{h\}$. Furthermore, for all other vertices $u \in V$ set $\tau(u) = \{3, 3 + h\}$. Finally, set $k := \binom{h}{2} + h$. It is straightforward to argue that the only way of satisfying v within the given budget is to connect it to h vertices forming an independent set. □

In contrast to DCE(e^-) and DCE(v^-), unless P = NP, DCE(e^+) cannot be NP-hard for constant values of r since we will later show fixed-parameter tractability for DCE(e^+) with respect to the parameter r.

2.1 Excluding Polynomial-Size Problem Kernels

Mathieson and Szeider [32] gave exponential-size problem kernels for DCE(v^-) and DCE($\{v^-, e^-\}$) with respect to the combined parameter (k, r). We prove

that these results are tight in the sense that, under standard complexity-theoretic assumptions, neither DCE(e^-) nor DCE(v^-) admits a polynomial-size problem kernel when parameterized by (k, r).

Theorem 3. DCE(e^-) *does not admit a polynomial-size problem kernel with respect to* (k, r) *unless NP* $\subseteq$ *coNP/poly.*

Proof. We provide a polynomial time and parameter transformation from the Clique problem parameterized by the "vertex cover number". Given a graph $G = (V, E)$ and a positive integer h, the Clique problem asks for a subset of at least h vertices that are pairwise adjacent, whereas the Vertex Cover problem asks for a subset V' of at most h vertices such that each edge in E has at least one endpoint in V'. Given a parameterized problem instance (I, k), a *polynomial time and parameter transformation* yields an equivalent instance $(I', p(k))$ in time $q(|I|)$ for polynomials p and q [3]. Since Clique parameterized by the "vertex cover number" does not admit a polynomial-size problem kernel [4], the statement of the theorem follows.

The details of the transformation are as follows. Let $(G = (V, E), h)$ be the Clique instance and let $X \subseteq V$ be a minimum vertex cover of G. If not given explicitly, then X can be efficiently computed with a simple factor-2 approximation which contains all endpoints of a maximal matching. We assume without loss of generality that each vertex in G has degree at least h. Note that any clique in G has size at most $|X| + 1$ since $V \setminus X$ forms an independent set of which at most one vertex can be in a clique. We can thus assume that $h \leq |X| + 1$. Two vertices $v_1, v_2 \in V \setminus X$ are called *twins* (with respect to X) if they have the same neighbors in X. A *twin class* with respect to X is a maximal subset $C \subseteq V \setminus X$ such that all pairs of vertices in C are twins. Obviously, the twin classes provide a partition of $V \setminus X$. Let $C_1, \ldots, C_\ell$ be the twin classes with respect to X. It holds that $\ell \leq \min\{2^{|X|}, n\}$. The idea of the construction is to have ℓ disjoint copies of $G[X]$, one together with a representative vertex of each twin class. The degree lists and the budget of edge deletions are chosen such that if we delete any edge from one of the copied subgraphs, then it is only possible to delete all edges of a clique of size h in that subgraph. Moreover, the subgraphs are connected to a binary tree which serves as a "selector" forcing any solution to delete edges in exactly one of the subgraphs.

The precise construction of the DCE(e^-) instance $(G' = (V', E'), k, r, \tau)$ works as follows: For $i \in \{1, \ldots, \ell\}$, let v_i be an arbitrary vertex of the twin class C_i. Furthermore, let $G_i := G[X \cup \{v_i\}]$. Initialize G' as the disjoint union of the graphs G_i, $1 \leq i \leq \ell$. Observe that G' contains ℓ copies of the vertex cover X. Next, add a binary tree of height $\lceil \log \ell \rceil \leq |X|$ with leaves $u_1, \ldots, u_\ell$ to G'. For each $i \in \{1, \ldots, \ell\}$, make u_i adjacent to all vertices in G_i. This completes the construction of G'; see Figure 1 for an example. Set $k := \binom{h}{2} + h + \lceil \log \ell \rceil$. For each $i \in \{1, \ldots, \ell\}$ and each vertex $v \in G_i$, set $\tau(v) := \{\deg_{G'}(v), \deg_{G'}(v) - h\}$. For each leaf u_i,



Figure 1: An example of the construction. The given graph is displayed at the left side with highlighted vertex cover (VC), independent set (IS), and twin classes in the independent set. The constructed graph is depicted on the right side. The three vertices in the upper half of each subgraph G_i, $1 \leq i \leq 4$, correspond to the vertex cover v_1, v_2, v_3. The fourth vertex in the lower half of each subgraph corresponds to a vertex from the twin class C_i.

set $\tau(u_i) := \{\deg_{G'}(u_i), \deg_{G'}(u_i) - h - 1\}$. For each inner vertex w in the binary tree, set $\tau(w) := \{3, 1\}$. Finally, for the root v of the binary tree, set $\tau(v) := \{1\}$. Observe that $r := \max_{u \in V'} \max \tau(u) \leq |X| + 2$ and $k \in O(|X|^2)$. Moreover, the above construction requires polynomial time.

It remains to show the correctness of our construction, that is, $I := (G, h)$ is a yes-instance of Clique if and only if $I' := (G', k, r, \tau)$ is a yes-instance of DCE(e^-).

"$\Rightarrow$:" Let (G, h) be a yes-instance, that is, G contains a clique C of size h. If C contains a vertex from $V \setminus X$, then let C_i denote its twin class (recall that there is at most one such vertex in C). Otherwise, set $i := 1$. Now, let $E'' \subseteq E'$ contain all edges between copies of the clique vertices in G_i. Moreover, let E'' contain all edges between u_i and the clique vertices in G_i and all edges along the path from u_i to the root v. The overall number of edges in E'' is at most k and it can easily be verified that, for each $v \in V'$, it holds $\deg_{G'-E''}(v) \in \tau(v)$. Thus, (G', k, r, τ) is a yes-instance.

"$\Leftarrow$:" Let (G', k, r, τ) be a yes-instance. Note that since $\deg_{G'}(v) = 2$ and $\tau(v) = \{1\}$, one of the two edges incident to v has to be deleted. Moreover, for all inner nodes w of the binary tree, we have $\tau(w) = \{3, 1\}$; this ensures that any solution deletes either zero or two edges incident to w. Consequently, every solution deletes all edges on one particular path from the root v to some leaf u_i. This requires $|X|$ edge deletions. Now consider

the leaves of the binary tree. Their degree constraints are chosen in such a way that any solution either deletes no edges or exactly $h+1$ edges incident to a leaf vertex. Thus, for the leaf u_i with one removed incident edge, it holds that h further edges from u_i to G_i are deleted in a solution. Finally, we are left with a budget of $\binom{h}{2}$ edge deletions in order to decrease the degrees of all h affected vertices in G_i by $h-1$. This is only possible if they form a clique in G_i, which in turn corresponds to a clique in G. □

Theorem 4. DCE(v$^-$) *does not admit a polynomial-size problem kernel with respect to* (k, r) *unless NP* $\subseteq$ *coNP/poly.*

Proof. We adjust our construction from Theorem 3 as follows: In the binary tree connecting all subgraphs G_i, make for each inner vertex v its two children adjacent. Furthermore, change the degree lists of all inner vertices except for the root from $\{1,3\}$ to $\{2,4\}$. The idea is that if a parent vertex is deleted, then one of its two children also has to be deleted in order to satisfy the remaining child vertex. To ensure that the root v with $\deg(v) = 2$ is deleted, set $\tau(v) := \{3\}$. In this way, the selection of the subgraph G_i via the binary tree works as in the reduction for DCE(e$^-$). As edges cannot be deleted any more, we also have to adjust our construction at the subgraphs G_i. For each leaf u_i of the binary tree, remove the edges between u_i and the vertices in G_i and add a new vertex u_i' that is adjacent to u_i and all vertices in G_i. Furthermore, add for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, \ell\}$ a clique C_i with $|X|^2$ vertices and make u_i' adjacent to all vertices in C_i. For each vertex $w \in C_i$, set $\tau(w) := \{\deg(w)\}$. Furthermore, set $\tau(u_i) := \{1,3\}$ and $\tau(u_i') := \{\deg(u_i'), |X|^2 + h\}$. For each vertex $w \in V(G_i)$, set $\tau(w) := \{\deg(w), h\}$. Finally, set $k := \lceil \log \ell \rceil + |X| + 1 - h$. Observe that $k \in O(|X|)$ and $r \in O(|X|^2)$. This construction requires polynomial time.

It remains to show the correctness of our construction, that is, $I := (G, h)$ is a yes-instance of Clique if and only if $I' := (G', k, r, \tau)$ is a yes-instance of DCE(v$^-$).

"⇒:" Let $C \subset V$ be a clique of size h in G. As C can contain at most one vertex from $V \setminus X$, there is a subgraph G_i in G' such that the vertices corresponding to C are also contained in G_i. Now, remove all other vertices in G_i and all vertices on the shortest path from u_i to the root v of the binary tree. Overall, we removed at most $|X| + 1 - h + \lceil \log \ell \rceil = k$ vertices. Furthermore, observe that in the remaining graph all vertices are satisfied, implying that I' is a yes-instance.

"⇐:" Assume that $C \subseteq V'$ is a solution for I', that is, each vertex in $G' - C$ is satisfied and $|C| \leq k$. First, observe that the root v of the binary tree is contained in C. We now show that we can assume that exactly one of the two children v_1, v_2 of v is also contained in C: Suppose that neither v_1 nor v_2 are contained in C. Hence, at least one child-vertex v_1' of v_1 and one child-vertex v_2' of v_2 are contained in C since otherwise v_1 or v_2 would not be

satisfied in $G - C$. Denote with v_1'' the second child-vertex of v_1. We create a solution C' for I' such that $|C| \geq |C'|$ by setting $C' := (C \cup \{v_1\}) \setminus \{v_2'\}$ and removing from C all vertices in the subtrees with root v_2 or with root v_1'', that is, all vertices that are in the same connected component with v_2 or v_1'' in $G' - \{v, v_1, v_1'\}$. As every vertex except v is satisfied in G', C is a solution for I', and v_2 and v_1'' are satisfied in $G' - C'$, it follows that C' is also a solution for I'. By iteratively applying this procedure to all inner vertices of the binary tree, we can assume that in this binary tree exactly the shortest path from v to one leaf, say u_i, is contained in the solution C. Since $|C_i| > k$, $\tau(w) = \{\deg(w)\}$ for all $w \in C_i$, and u_i' is adjacent to all vertices in C_i, it follows that $u_i' \notin C$. As $u_i \in C$, this implies that all but h vertices in G_i are contained in C. Since for each w of these h remaining vertices it holds $\tau(w) = \{\deg(w), h\}$, it follows that they form a clique of order h. Thus, I is a yes-instance. □

Having established these computational lower bounds, we next show that in contrast to DCE(e^-) and DCE(v^-), DCE(e^+) admits a polynomial kernel with respect to (k, r).

2.2 A Polynomial Kernel for DCE(e^+) with Respect to (k, r)

In order to describe the kernelization for DCE(e^+), we need some further notation: For $i \in \{0, \ldots, r\}$, a vertex $v \in V$ is of *type* i if and only if $\deg(v) + i \in \tau(v)$, that is, v can be satisfied by adding i edges to it. The set of all vertices of type i is denoted by T_i. Observe that a vertex can be of multiple types, implying that for $i \neq j$ the vertex sets T_i and T_j are not necessarily disjoint. Furthermore, notice that the type-0 vertices are exactly the satisfied ones. We remark that there are instances for DCE(e^+) where we might have to add edges between two satisfied vertices (though this may seem counter-intuitive): Consider, for example, a three-vertex graph without any edges, the degree list function values are $\{2\}, \{0, 2\}, \{0, 2\}$, and $k = 3$. The two vertices with degree list $\{0, 2\}$ are satisfied. However, the only solution for this instance is to add *all* edges.

Now, we describe our kernelization algorithm: The basic strategy is to keep the unsatisfied vertices U and "enough" arbitrary vertices of each type (from the satisfied vertices) and delete all other vertices. The idea behind the correctness is that the vertices in a solution are somehow "interchangeable". If an unsatisfied vertex needs an edge to a satisfied vertex of type i, then it is not important which satisfied type-i vertex is used. We only have to take care not to "reuse" the satisfied vertices to avoid the creation of multiple edges.

Next, we specify what we mean by "enough" vertices: The "magic number" is $\alpha := k(\Delta_G + 2)$. This leads to the definition of *α-type sets*: An α-type set $C \subseteq V$ is a vertex subset containing all unsatisfied vertices U



Figure 2: An example for safely removing a vertex from a graph. The sets next to the vertices denote the degree lists defined by the degree list function τ. Observe that in both graphs the vertex u is of type zero and of type one, the vertex v is of type zero, and the vertex w is of type one.

and $\min\{\alpha, |T_i \setminus U|\}$ type-i vertices from $T_i \setminus U$ for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$. We will soon show that for any fixed α-type set C, deleting all vertices in $V \setminus C$ results in an equivalent instance. However, deleting a vertex changes the degrees of its neighbors. Thus, we also have to adjust their degree lists. Formally, for a vertex subset $V' \subseteq V$, we define $\tau_{V'} \colon (V \setminus V') \to 2^{\{0,\ldots,r\}}$, where for each $u \in V \setminus V'$, we set $\tau_{V'}(u) := \{d \in \mathbb{N} \mid d + |N_G(u) \cap V'| \in \tau(u)\}$. Then, *safely removing* a vertex set $V' \subseteq V$ from the instance (G, k, r, τ) means to replace the instance with $(G - V', k, r, \tau_{V'})$, see Figure 2 for an example. With these definitions we can provide our reduction rules leading to a polynomial-size problem kernel.

Rule 1. *Let $(G = (V, E), k, r, \tau)$ be an instance of* DCE(e^+) *and let $C \subseteq V$ be an α-type set in G. Then, safely remove all vertices in $V \setminus C$.*

We next show that we can apply Reduction Rule 1 in linear time. Notice that in our setting linear time does *not* mean $O(n + m)$ as it is usually the case with graph problems. The reason is that the degree list function τ may contain up to r possible degrees for each vertex; this gives up to $rn \notin O(n+m)$ possible degrees overall. Therefore, linear time means in our setting $O(m+|\tau|)$ time, where $|\tau| \geq n$ denotes the encoding size of τ. In the following we will assume that the encoding of τ requires at least one bit per possible degree and thus $|\tau| \geq n$.

Lemma 1. *Reduction Rule 1 is correct and can be applied in linear time.*

Proof. We first prove the correctness of the reduction rule. To this end, the given DCE(e^+) instance is denoted by $I := (G = (V, E), k, r, \tau)$. We fix any α-type set $C \subseteq V$. Furthermore, denote by I' the resulting instance when safely removing $V \setminus C$, formally, $I' := (G[C], k, r, \tau_{V \setminus C})$. As all vertices in $V \setminus C$ are satisfied, it follows that any edge set that is a solution for I' is also a solution for I. Hence, if I' is a yes-instance, then also I is a yes-instance. To complete the correctness proof, it remains to prove the reverse direction.

Let $E' \subseteq \binom{V}{2} \setminus E$ be a solution for I, that is, $\forall v \in V \colon \deg_{G+E'}(v) \in \tau(v)$. Observe that if $V(E') \subseteq C$, then E' is also a solution for I'. Hence, it remains

to consider the case $V(E') \setminus C \neq \emptyset$. Let $v \in V(E') \setminus C$. We show how to construct from E' a solution E'' for I such that $(V(E') \setminus C) \setminus V(E'') = \{v\}$. Let $i \leq k$ denote the number of edges in E' with endpoint v. Since v is not in the α-type set C, it follows that $v \notin U$ and $|C \cap T_i| = \alpha = k(\Delta_G + 2)$. Next, we show that there is a type-i vertex $u \in C$ such that $u \notin V(E')$ and $u \notin N_G(N_{G[E']}(v))$, that is, u is not incident to any edge in E' and also not adjacent to any vertex that is connected to v by an edge in E'. Note that "replacing" v by such a vertex u in the edge set E' yields E'': Formally, for $E'' := \{\{u, w\} \mid \{v, w\} \in E'\} \cup \{\{w_1, w_2\} \mid \{w_1, w_2\} \in E' \wedge w_1 \neq v \wedge w_2 \neq v\}$, it holds that $E'' \cap E = \emptyset$ and since u is also of type i, all degree constraints are satisfied in $G + E''$. Hence, it remains to show that such a vertex u exists, that is, $(C \cap T_i) \setminus (V(E') \cup N_G(N_{G[E']}(v)))$ is indeed non-empty. This is true since $|C \cap T_i| = k(\Delta_G + 2)$, whereas $|V(E') \cup N_G(N_{G[E']}(v))| < 2k + k\Delta_G$. By iteratively applying this procedure, we obtain a solution for I'. Hence, I' is a yes-instance if I is a yes-instance. This proves the correctness.

To compute the α-type set C in linear time, initialize $C := \emptyset$, $U := \emptyset$, and r counters $c_1 := c_2 := \ldots := c_r := 0$ (one for each type). Then, for each vertex v, compute the types of v in $O(|\tau(v)|)$ time and let $I \subseteq \{1, \ldots, r\}$ be the set of types of v. If v is unsatisfied or if $c_i \leq \alpha$ for some $i \in I$, then add v to C. If v is satisfied, then increase c_i by one for each $i \in I$. Now that we computed the vertices in C in linear time, it remains to compute their correct degree lists. To this end, for each vertex $v \in C$, compute $\gamma := \deg_G(v) - \deg_{G[C]}$ (doable in $O(\deg(v))$ time) and set $\tau_{V \setminus C}(v) := \{d \geq 0 \mid d + \gamma \in \tau(v)\}$ in $O(|\tau(v)|)$ time. Overall, we safely removed all vertices in $V \setminus C$ in linear time. □

As each α-type set contains at most α satisfied vertices of each vertex type, it follows that after one application of Reduction Rule 1 the graph contains at most $|C| = |U| + r\alpha$ vertices. The number of unsatisfied vertices in an α-type set can always be bounded by $|U| \leq 2k$ since we can increase the degrees of at most $2k$ vertices by adding k edges. If there are more than $2k$ unsatisfied vertices, then we return a trivial no-instance. Thus, we end up with $|C| \leq 2k + rk(\Delta_G + 2)$. To obtain a polynomial-size problem kernel with respect to the combined parameter (k, r), we need to bound the maximum vertex degree Δ_G. However, this can easily be achieved: Since we only allow edge additions, for each vertex $v \in V$, we have $\deg(v) \leq \max \tau(v) \leq r$. Formalized as a data reduction rule, this reads as follows:

Rule 2. *Let $(G = (V, E), k, r, \tau)$ be an instance of* DCE(e$^+$). *If G contains more than $2k$ unsatisfied vertices or if there exists a vertex $v \in V$ with $\deg(v) > \max \tau(v)$, then return a trivial no-instance.*

Having applied Reduction Rules 1 and 2 once, it holds that $\Delta_G \leq r$ and thus the graph contains at most $2k + rk(r + 2)$ vertices. Lemma 1 ensures

that we can apply Reduction Rule 1 in linear time. Clearly, Reduction Rule 2 can be applied in linear time, too. This leads to the following.

Theorem 5. DCE(e^+) *admits a problem kernel containing* $O(kr^2)$ *vertices computable in linear time.*

Having computed the problem kernel due to Theorem 5, one can solve DCE(e^+) by simply trying all possibilities to add at most k edges with endpoints in the remaining $O(kr^2)$ vertices. This gives the following.

Corollary 1. DCE(e^+) *can be solved in* $(kr)^{O(k)} + O(m + |\tau|)$ *time.*

2.3 A Polynomial Kernel for DCE(e^+) with Respect to r

In this subsection, by adapting among other things some ideas of Hartung et al. [24], we show how to upper-bound k by a polynomial of r. Combining this upper-bound of k with Theorem 5 results in a polynomial-size problem kernel for the single parameter r. The general strategy to obtain the upper-bound is inspired by a heuristic of Clarkson et al. [11] and will be as follows: First, remove the graph structure and solve the problem on the degree sequence of the input graph by using dynamic programming. The solution to this number problem will indicate the *demand* for each vertex, that is, the number of added edges incident to that vertex. Then, using a result due to Katerinis and Tsikopoulos [26], we prove that either $k \leq r(r+1)^2$ or we can find a set of edges satisfying the specified demands in polynomial time.

We start by formally defining the number problem and showing its polynomial-time solvability.

Number Constraint Editing (NCE)
Input: A function $\phi\colon \{1,\dots,n\} \to 2^{\{0,\dots,r\}}$ and positive integers $d_1,\dots,d_n,k,r$.
Question: Are there n positive integers $d'_1,\dots,d'_n$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^{n}(d'_i - d_i) = k$ and for all $i \in \{1,\dots,n\}$ it holds that $d'_i \geq d_i$ and $d'_i \in \phi(i)$?

Lemma 2. NCE *is solvable in* $O(n \cdot k \cdot r)$ *time.*

Proof. We provide a simple dynamic programming algorithm for NCE. To this end, we define a two-dimensional table T as follows: For $i \in \{1,\dots,n\}$ and $j \in \{1,\dots,k\}$, the entry $T[i,j]$ is `true` if and only if the instance $(d_1,\dots,d_i,j,r,\phi)$ is a yes-instance. Hence, $T[n,k]$ stores the answer to the instance $(d_1,\dots,d_n,k,r,\phi)$.

In order to compute T, we use the following recurrence:

$$(T[i,j] = \texttt{true}) \iff (\exists x \in \phi(i)\colon x \geq d_i \wedge T[i-1, j-(x-d_i)] = \texttt{true}). \tag{1}$$

The recursion terminates with

$$T[1,j] := \begin{cases} \texttt{true}, & \text{if } d_1 + j \in \phi(1), \\ \texttt{false}, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

The correctness follows from the fact that at position i all possibilities for d'_i are considered. Also the running time is not hard to see: There are $n \cdot k$ entries and the computation of one entry requires to check at most r possibilities for the value x in Equivalence (1). As each check is doable in $O(1)$ time, the overall running time sums up to $O(n \cdot k \cdot r)$. □

Lemma 2 can be proved with a dynamic program that specifies the demand for each vertex, that is, the number of added edges incident to each vertex. Given these demands, the remaining problem is to decide whether there exists a set of edges that satisfy these demands and are not contained in the input graph G. This problem is closely related to the polynomial-time solvable f-Factor problem [30, Chapter 10], a special case of DCE(e^-) where $|\tau(v)| = 1$ for all $v \in V$; it is formally defined as follows:

f-Factor
Input: A graph $G = (V, E)$ and a function $f\colon V \to \mathbb{N}_0$.
Question: Is there an *f-factor*, that is, a subgraph $G' = (V, E')$ of G such that $\deg_{G'}(v) = f(v)$ for all $v \in V$?

Observe that our problem of satisfying the demands of the vertices in G is essentially the question whether there is an f-factor in the complement graph $\overline{G}$ where the function f stores the demand of each vertex. Having formulated our problem as f-Factor, we use the following result about the existence of an f-factor.

Lemma 3 (Katerinis and Tsikopoulos [26])**.** *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph with minimum vertex degree δ_G and let $a \leq b$ be two positive integers. Suppose further that*

$$\delta_G \geq \frac{b}{a+b}|V| \text{ and } |V| > \frac{a+b}{a}(b+a-3).$$

Then, for any function $f\colon V \to \{a, a+1, ..., b\}$ where $\sum_{v \in V} f(v)$ is even, G has an f-factor.

As we are interested in an f-factor of the complement graph $\overline{G}$ of our input graph G and the demand for each vertex is at most r, we use Lemma 3 with $\delta_{\overline{G}} \geq n - r - 1$, $a = 1$, and $b = r$ yielding the following.

Lemma 4. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph with n vertices, $\delta_G \geq n - r - 1$, $r \geq 1$, and let $f\colon V \to \{1, \ldots, r\}$ be a function such that $\sum_{v \in V} f(v)$ is even. If $n \geq (r+1)^2$, then G has an f-factor.*

Proof. Set $a = 1$ and $b = r$. Then, $\delta_G \geq n - r - 1 \geq \frac{b}{a+b}n = \frac{r}{r+1}n$ holds if $n \geq (r+1)^2$, which is true by assumption. Also, $\frac{a+b}{a}(b + a - 3) = (r+1)(r-2) = r^2 - r - 2 < (r+1)^2 \leq n$ holds, and thus all conditions of Lemma 3 are fulfilled. □

We now have all ingredients to show that we can upper-bound k by $r(r+1)^2$ or solve the given instance of DCE(e$^+$) in polynomial time. The main technical statement towards this is the following.

Lemma 5. *Let $I := (G = (V, E), k, r, \tau)$ be an instance of* DCE(e$^+$) *with $k \geq r(r+1)^2$ and $V = \{v_1, \ldots, v_n\}$. If there exists a $k' \in \{r(r+1)^2, \ldots, k\}$ such that $(\deg(v_1), \ldots, \deg(v_n), 2k', r, \phi)$ with $\phi(i) := \tau(v_i)$ is a yes-instance of* NCE*, then I is a yes-instance of* DCE(e$^+$)*.*

Proof. Assume that $(\deg(v_1), \ldots, \deg(v_n), 2k', r, \phi)$ is a yes-instance of NCE. Let $d'_1, \ldots, d'_n$ be integers such that $d'_i \in \tau(v_i)$, $\sum_{i=1}^{n} d'_i - \deg(v_i) = 2k'$, and $d'_i \geq d_i$. Hence, we know that the degree constraints can numerically be satisfied, giving rise to a new target degree d'_i for each vertex v_i. Let $A := \{v_i \in V \mid d'_i > \deg(v_i)\}$ denote the set of *affected* vertices containing all vertices which require addition of at least one edge in order to fulfill their degree constraints. It remains to show that the degree sequence of the affected vertices can in fact be realized by adding k' edges to $G[A]$. To this end, it is sufficient to prove the existence of an f-factor in the complement graph $\overline{G[A]}$ with $f(v_i) := d'_i - \deg(v_i) \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$ for all $v_i \in A$ since such an f-factor contains exactly the k' edges we want to add to G. Thus, it remains to check that all conditions of Lemma 4 are indeed satisfied to conclude the existence of the sought f-factor. First, note that $\delta_{\overline{G[A]}} \geq |A| - r - 1$ since $\Delta_{G[A]} \leq r$. Moreover, $\sum_{v_i \in A}(d'_i - \deg(v_i)) = 2k' \leq |A|r$, and thus $|A| \geq 2k'/r \geq 2(r+1)^2$. Finally, $\sum_{v_i \in A} f(v_i) = 2k'$ is even and thus Lemma 4 applies. □

As NCE is polynomial-time solvable, Lemma 5 states a *win-win situation*: either the solution is bounded in size or can be found in polynomial time. From this and Theorem 5, we obtain the polynomial-size problem kernel.

Theorem 6. DCE(e$^+$) *admits a problem kernel containing $O(r^5)$ vertices computable in $O(k^2 \cdot r \cdot n + m + |\tau|)$ time.*

Proof. Let $I := (G, k, r, \tau)$ be an instance of DCE(e$^+$). We distinguish two cases concerning the size of k.

Case 1. $k > r(r+1)^2$**:** We solve for all $k' \in \{r(r+1)^2, \ldots, k\}$ the corresponding NCE formulation. If for one k', we encounter a yes-instance of the NCE formulation, then, due to Lemma 5, we return a trivial yes-instance of constant size. By Lemma 2, this can be done in polynomial time. Otherwise, as each solution for DCE(e$^+$) can be transferred to a solution of NCE, it follows that there is no solution for I of size k'

for any $k' \in \{r(r+1)^2, \ldots, k\}$. Thus, I is a yes-instance if and only if $(G, r(r+1)^2, r, \tau)$ is a yes-instance Hence, set $k := r(r+1)^2$ and proceed as in the Case 2.

Case 2. $k \leq r(r+1)^2$**:** We simply run the kernelization algorithm from Theorem 5 on I to obtain an $O(r^5)$-vertex problem kernel.

Concerning the running time, observe that we have to solve at most k times an instance of NCE. By Lemma 2, we can determine in $O(k \cdot r \cdot n)$ time for each of these at most k instances whether it is a yes- or no-instance. If one instance is a yes-instance, due to Lemma 5, then the kernelization algorithm can return a trivial yes-instance in constant time. Otherwise, we apply Theorem 5 in $O(m + |\tau|)$ time. Overall, this gives a running time of $O(k^2 \cdot r \cdot n + m + |\tau|)$. □

Due to the bound on k given by Lemma 5, we can infer from Theorem 6 and Corollary 1 the following.

Corollary 2. DCE(e^+) *can be solved in* $r^{O(r^3)} + O(k^2 \cdot r \cdot n + m + |\tau|)$ *time.*

3 A General Approach for Degree Sequence Completion

In the previous section, we dealt with the problem DCE(e^+), where one only has to *locally* satisfy the degree of each vertex. In this section, we show how the presented ideas for DCE(e^+) can also be used to solve more *globally* defined problems where the degree sequence of the solution graph G' has to fulfill a given property. For example, consider the problem of adding a minimum number of edges to obtain a regular graph, that is, a graph where all vertices have the same degree. In this case the degree of a vertex in the solution is a priori not known but depends on the degrees of the other vertices. Using f-Factor, this particular problem can be solved in polynomial time; however, there are many NP-hard problems of this kind, including Degree Anonymity as will be discussed in Section 3.2.

The *degree sequence* of a graph $G = (V, E)$ with n vertices is the n-tuple containing the vertex degrees in nonincreasing order. Then, for some tuple property Π, we consider the following problem:

Π-Degree Sequence Completion (Π-DSC)
Input: A graph $G = (V, E)$, an integer $k \in \mathbb{N}$.
Question: Is there a set of edges $E' \subseteq \binom{V}{2} \setminus E$ with $|E'| \leq k$ such that the degree sequence of $G + E'$ fulfills Π?

Note that Π-DSC is not a generalization of DCE(e^+) since in DCE(e^+) one can require for two vertices u and v of the same degree that u gets two

more incident edges and v not. This cannot be expressed in Π-DSC. We remark that the results stated in this section can be extended to hold for a generalized version of Π-DSC where a "degree list function" τ is given as additional input and the vertices in the solution graph G' also have to satisfy τ, thus generalizing DCE(e^+). For simplicity, however, we stick to the easier problem definition as stated above.

3.1 Fixed-Parameter Tractability of Π-DSC

In this subsection, we first generalize the ideas behind Theorem 5 to show fixed-parameter tractability of Π-DSC with respect to the combined parameter (k, Δ_G). Then, we present an adjusted version of Lemma 5 and apply it to show fixed-parameter tractability for Π-DSC with respect to the parameter $\Delta_{G'}$. Clearly, a prerequisite for both these results is that the following problem has to be fixed-parameter tractable with respect to the parameter $\Delta_T := \max\{d_1, \ldots, d_n\}$.

Π-Decision
Input: An integer tuple $T = (d_1, \ldots, d_n)$.
Question: Does T fulfill Π?

For the next result, we need some definitions. For $0 \leq d \leq \Delta_G$, let $D_G(d) := \{v \in V \mid \deg_G(v) = d\}$ be the *block* of degree d, that is, the set of all vertices with degree d in G. A subset $V' \subseteq V$ is an *α-block set* if V' contains for every $d \in \{1, \ldots, \Delta_G\}$ exactly $\min\{\alpha, |D_G(d)|\}$ vertices. Recall that $\alpha = (\Delta_G + 2)k$, see Section 2.2, and notice the similarity of α-block sets and α-type sets. This similarity is not a coincidence as we use ideas of Reduction Rule 1 and Lemma 1 to obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 6. *Let $I := (G = (V, E), k)$ be a yes-instance of* Π-DSC *and let $C \subseteq V$ be an α-block set. Then, there exists a set of edges $E' \subseteq \binom{C}{2} \setminus E$ with $|E'| \leq k$ such that the degree sequence of $G + E'$ fulfills* Π.

Proof. Let $I := (G = (V, E), k)$ be a yes-instance of Π-DSC and let $C \subseteq V$ be an α-block set. Thus, there exists a set of edges $E' \subseteq \binom{V}{2} \setminus E$ with $|E'| \leq k$ such that the degree sequence $\mathcal{D} = (d'_1, \ldots, d'_n)$ of $G' := G + E'$ fulfills Π. If $V(E') \subseteq C$, then there is nothing to prove. Hence, assume that there exists a vertex $v \in V(E') \setminus C$. We show how to construct from E' an edge set E'' for I such that $(V(E') \setminus C) \setminus V(E'') = \{v\}$ and the degree sequence of $G'' := G + E''$ equals $\mathcal{D}$. Since v is not in the α-block set C, it follows that $|C \cap D_G(\deg_G(v))| = \alpha = k(\Delta_G + 2)$. Next, we prove that there is a vertex $u \in D_G(\deg_G(v))$ such that $u \notin V(E')$ and $u \notin N_G(N_{G[E']}(v))$, that is, u is not incident to any edge in E' and also not adjacent to any vertex that is connected to v by an edge in E'. Note that "replacing" v by such a vertex u in the edge set E' yields E'': Formally, for

$$E'' := \{\{u, w\} \mid \{v, w\} \in E'\} \cup \{\{w_1, w_2\} \mid \{w_1, w_2\} \in E' \wedge w_1 \neq v \wedge w_2 \neq v\},$$

it holds that $E'' \cap E = \emptyset$ and since $u \in D_G(\deg_G(v))$, the degree sequence of $G + E''$ is $\mathcal{D}$. Hence, it remains to show that such a vertex u exists, that is, $(C \cap D_G(\deg_G(v))) \setminus (V(E') \cup N_G(N_{G[E']}(v)))$ is indeed non-empty. This is true since $|C \cap D_G(\deg_G(v))| = k(\Delta_G+2)$, whereas $|V(E') \cup N_G(N_{G[E']}(v))| < 2k + k\Delta_G$. By repeatedly applying this procedure, we obtain a solution $E''' \subseteq \binom{C}{2} \setminus E$ with $|E'''| \leq k$ such that the degree sequence of $G + E'''$ fulfills Π. □

In the context of DCE(S), we introduced the notion of safely removing a vertex subset to obtain a problem kernel. On the contrary, in the context of Π-DSC, it seems impossible to remove vertices in general without further knowledge about the tuple property Π. Thus, Lemma 6 does not lead to a problem kernel but only to a reduced search space for a solution, namely any α-block set. Clearly, an α-block set C can be computed in polynomial time. Then, one can simply try out all possibilities to add edges with endpoints in C and check whether in one of the cases the degree sequence of the resulting graph satisfies Π. As $|C| \leq (\Delta_G + 2)k\Delta_G$, there are at most $O(2^{((\Delta_G+2)k\Delta_G)^2})$ possible subsets of edges to add. Altogether, this leads to the following theorem.

Theorem 7. *Let Π be some tuple property. If Π-Decision is fixed-parameter tractable with respect to the maximum tuple entry Δ_T, then Π-DSC is fixed-parameter tractable with respect to (k, Δ_G).*

Bounding the Solution Size k in $\Delta_{G'}$ We now show how to extend the ideas of Section 2.3 to the context of Π-DSC in order to bound the solution size k by a polynomial in $\Delta_{G'}$. The general procedure still is the one inspired by Clarkson et al. [11]: Solve the number problem corresponding to Π-DSC on the degree sequence of the input graph and then try to "realize" the solution. To this end, we define the corresponding number problem as follows:

Π-Number Sequence Completion (Π-NSC)
Input: Positive integers $d_1, \ldots, d_n, k, \Delta$.
Question: Are there n nonnegative integers $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ with $\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i = k$ such that $(d_1 + x_1, \ldots, d_n + x_n)$ fulfills Π and $d_i + x_i \leq \Delta$?

With these problem definitions, we can now generalize Lemma 5.

Lemma 7. *Let $I := (G, k)$ be an instance of Π-DSC with $V = \{v_1, \ldots, v_n\}$ and $k \geq \Delta_{G'}(\Delta_{G'} + 1)^2$. If there exists a $k' \in \{\Delta_{G'}(\Delta_{G'} + 1)^2, \ldots, k\}$ such that the corresponding Π-NSC instance $I' := (\deg(v_1), \ldots, \deg(v_n), 2k', \Delta_{G'})$ is a yes-instance, then I is a yes-instance.*

Proof. Let $I' := (\deg(v_1), \ldots, \deg(v_n), 2k', \Delta_{G'})$ with $k' \in \{\Delta_{G'}(\Delta_{G'} + 1)^2, \ldots, k\}$ be a yes-instance of Π-NSC and let $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ denote a solution for I'. Defining the function $f\colon V \to \mathbb{N}$ as $f(v_i) := x_i$, we now

prove that $\overline{G}$ contains an f-factor which forms a solution E' for I. Denote by A the set of affected vertices, formally, $A := \{v_i \in V \mid 0 < x_i\}$. Observe that $|A| \geq 2k'/\Delta_{G'} \geq 2(\Delta_{G'}+1)^2$ as $k' \geq \Delta_{G'}(\Delta_{G'}+1)^2$. Furthermore, as the maximum degree Δ_G in G is upper-bounded by$\Delta_{G'}$, it follows that $\overline{G[A]}$ has minimum degree at least $|A| - \Delta_{G'} - 1$. Finally, observe that $f(v_i) \in \{1, \ldots, \Delta_{G'}\}$ for each $v_i \in A$ and that $\sum_{v_i \in A} f(v_i) = 2k'$ is even. Hence, by Lemma 4, $\overline{G[A]}$ contains an f-factor. Thus, $\overline{G}$ also contains an f-factor $G' = (V, E')$ and since $(\deg(v_1) + x_1, \ldots, \deg(v_n) + x_n)$ fulfills Π, it follows that E' is a solution for I, implying that I is a yes-instance. □

Let function $g(|I|)$ denote the running time for solving the Π-NSC instance I. Clearly, if there is a solution for an instance of Π-DSC, then there also exists a solution for the corresponding Π-NSC instance. It follows that we can decide whether there is a large solution for Π-DSC (adding at least $\Delta_{G'}(\Delta_{G'}+1)^2$ edges) in $k \cdot g(n \log(n))$ time. Hence, we arrive at the following win-win situation:

Corollary 3. *Let g denote the running time for solving* Π-NSC. *There is an algorithm running in $g(n \log(n)) \cdot n^{O(1)}$ time that given an instance $I := (G, k)$ of* Π-DSC *returns "yes" or "no" such that if it answers "yes", then I is a yes-instance, and otherwise I is a yes-instance if and only if $(G, \min\{k, \Delta_{G'}(\Delta_{G'}+1)^2\})$ is a yes-instance.*

Using Corollary 3, we can transfer the fixed-parameter tractability for Π-NSC with respect to Δ to a fixed-parameter tractability result for Π-DSC with respect to $\Delta_{G'}$. Notice that $\Delta_{G'} \leq k + \Delta_G$, that is, $\Delta_{G'}$ is a smaller and thus "stronger" parameter [28]. Also, showing Π-NSC to be fixed-parameter tractable with respect to Δ might be a significantly easier task than proving fixed-parameter tractability for Π-DSC with respect to $\Delta_{G'}$ directly since the graph structure can be completely ignored.

Theorem 8. *If* Π-NSC *is fixed-parameter tractable with respect to Δ, then* Π-DSC *is fixed-parameter tractable with respect to $\Delta_{G'}$.*

Proof. Let $I := (G, k)$ be a Π-DSC instance. First, note that $\Delta_G \leq \Delta_{G'}$ always holds since we are only adding edges to G. Thus, if $k \leq \Delta_{G'}(\Delta_{G'}+1)^2$, then the fixed-parameter tractability with respect to (k, Δ_G) from Theorem 7 yields fixed-parameter tractability with respect to $\Delta_{G'}$. Otherwise, we use Corollary 3 to check whether there exists a large solution of size at least $\Delta_{G'}(\Delta_{G'}+1)^2$. Hence, by assumption, in $f(\Delta_{G'}) \cdot n^{O(1)}$ time for some computable function f, we either find that I is a yes-instance or we can assume that $k \leq \Delta_{G'}(\Delta_{G'}+1)^2$, which altogether yields fixed-parameter tractability with respect to $\Delta_{G'}$. □

If Π-NSC can be solved in polynomial time, then Corollary 3 shows that we can assume that $k \leq \Delta_{G'}(\Delta_{G'}+1)^2$. Thus, as in the DCE($e^+$) setting

(Theorem 6), polynomial kernels with respect to (k, Δ_G) transfer to the parameter $\Delta_{G'}$, leading to the following.

Theorem 9. *If* Π-NSC *is polynomial-time solvable and* Π-DSC *admits a polynomial kernel with respect to* (k, Δ_G)*, then* Π-DSC *also admits a polynomial kernel with respect to* $\Delta_{G'}$*.*

3.2 Applications

As our general approach is inspired by ideas of Hartung et al. [24], it is not surprising that it can be applied to "their" Degree Anonymity problem:

Degree Anonymity
Input: A graph $G = (V, E)$ and two positive integers k and s.
Question: Is there an edge set E' over V of size at most s such that $G' := G + E'$ is k-*anonymous*, that is, for each vertex $v \in V$, there are at least $k - 1$ other vertices in G' having the same degree?

The property Π of being k-anonymous clearly can be decided in polynomial time for a given degree sequence and thus, by Theorem 7, we immediately get fixed-parameter tractability with respect to (s, Δ_G). Theorem 9 then basically yields the kernel result obtained by Hartung et al. [24].There are more general versions of Degree Anonymity as proposed by Chester et al. [10]. For example, just a given subset of the vertices has to be anonymized or the vertices have labels. As in each of these generalizations one can decide in polynomial time whether a given graph satisfies the particular anonymity requirement, Theorem 7 applies also in these scenarios. However, checking in which of these more general settings the conditions of Theorem 8 or Theorem 9 are fulfilled is future work.

Besides the graph anonymization setting, one could think of further, more generalized constraints on the degree sequence. For example, if $p_i(d)$ denotes how often degree i appears in a degree sequence $\mathcal{D}$, then being k-anonymous translates into $p_i(\mathcal{D}_{G'}) \geq k$ for all degrees i occurring in the degree sequence $\mathcal{D}_{G'}$ of the modified graph G'. Now, it is natural to consider not only a lower bound $k \leq p_i(\mathcal{D})$, but also an upper bound $p_i(\mathcal{D}) \leq u$ or maybe even a set of allowed frequencies $p_i(\mathcal{D}) \in F_i \subseteq \mathbb{N}$. Constraints like this allow to express some properties, not of individual degrees itself but on the whole distribution of the degrees in the resulting sequence. For example, to have some "balancedness" one can require that each occurring degree occurs exactly ℓ times for some $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ [9]. To obtain some sort of "robustness" it might be useful to ask for an h-index of ℓ, that is, in the solution graph there are at least ℓ vertices with degree at least ℓ [14].

Another range of problems which fit naturally into our framework involves completion problems to a graph class that is completely characterized by

degree sequences. Many results concerning the relation between a degree sequence and the corresponding realizing graph are known and can be found in the literature; one of the first is the well-known result by Erdős and Gallai [15] showing which degree sequences are in fact graphic, that is, realizable by a graph. Based on this characterization researchers characterized for example pseudo-split, split, and threshold graphs completely by their degree sequences [22, 23, 31]. The NP-hard Split Graph Completion [34] problem, for example, is known to be fixed-parameter tractable with respect to the allowed number of edge additions [8]. Note, however, that for the mentioned graph classes polynomial kernels with respect to the parameter $\Delta_{G'}$ trivially exist because here we always have $\sqrt{n} \leq \Delta_G$.

We finish with another interesting example of a class of graphs characterized by their degree sequence: A graph is a *unigraph* if it is determined by its degree sequence up to isomorphism [6]. Given a degree sequence $\mathcal{D} = (d_1, \ldots, d_n)$, one can decide in linear time whether $\mathcal{D}$ defines a unigraph [5, 27]. Again, by Theorem 8, we conclude fixed-parameter tractability for the unigraph completion problem with respect to the parameter maximum degree in the solution graph $\Delta_{G'}$.

4 Conclusion

We proposed a method for deriving efficient and effective preprocessing algorithms for degree sequence completion problems. DCE(e^+) served as our main illustrating example. Roughly speaking, the core of the approach (as basically already used in previous work [11, 24]) consists of extracting the degree sequence from the input graph, efficiently solving a simpler number editing problem, and translating the obtained solution back into a solution for the graph problem using f-factors. While previous work [11, 24] was specifically tailored towards an application for degree anonymization in graphs, we generalized the approach by filtering out problem-specific parts and "universal" parts. Thus, whenever one can solve these problem-specific parts efficiently, we can automatically obtain efficient preprocessing and fixed-parameter tractability results.

Our approach seems promising for future empirical investigations; a very recent experimental work has been performed for Degree Anonymity [25]. Another line of future research could be to study polynomial-time approximation algorithms for the considered degree sequence completion problems. Perhaps parts of our preprocessing approach might find use here as well. A more specific open question concerning our work would be how to deal with additional connectivity requirements for the generated graphs.

References

[1] H. L. Bodlaender. Kernelization: New upper and lower bound techniques. In *Proceedings of the 4th International Workshop on Parameterized and Exact Computation (IWPEC '09)*, volume 5917 of *LNCS*, pages 17–37. Springer, 2009. 4

[2] H. L. Bodlaender, F. V. Fomin, D. Lokshtanov, E. Penninkx, S. Saurabh, and D. M. Thilikos. (Meta) kernelization. In *Proceedings of the 50th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS '09)*, pages 629–638. IEEE, 2009. 3

[3] H. L. Bodlaender, S. Thomassé, and A. Yeo. Kernel bounds for disjoint cycles and disjoint paths. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 412(35):4570–4578, 2011. 6

[4] H. L. Bodlaender, B. M. P. Jansen, and S. Kratsch. Kernelization lower bounds by cross-composition. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 28(1):277–305, 2014. 6

[5] A. Borri, T. Calamoneri, and R. Petreschi. Recognition of unigraphs through superposition of graphs. *Journal of Graph Algorithms and Applications*, 15(3):323–343, 2011. 20

[6] A. Brandstädt, V. B. Le, and J. P. Spinrad. *Graph Classes: a Survey*, volume 3 of *SIAM Monographs on Discrete Mathematics and Applications*. SIAM, 1999. 20

[7] R. Bredereck, S. Hartung, A. Nichterlein, and G. J. Woeginger. The complexity of finding a large subgraph under anonymity constraints. In *Proceedings of the 24th International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation (ISAAC '07)*, volume 8283 of *LNCS*, pages 152–162. Springer, 2013. 3

[8] L. Cai. Fixed-parameter tractability of graph modification problems for hereditary properties. *Information Processing Letters*, 58(4):171–176, 1996. 20

[9] G. Chartrand, L. Lesniak, C. M. Mynhardt, and O. R. Oellermann. Degree uniform graphs. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 555(1):122–132, 1989. 19

[10] S. Chester, B. Kapron, G. Srivastava, and S. Venkatesh. Complexity of social network anonymization. *Social Network Analysis and Mining*, 3 (2):151–166, 2013. 19

[11] K. L. Clarkson, K. Liu, and E. Terzi. Towards identity anonymization in social networks. In *Link Mining: Models, Algorithms, and Applications*, pages 359–385. Springer, 2010. 2, 3, 12, 17, 20

[12] G. Cornuéjols. General factors of graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory. Series B*, 45(2):185–198, 1988. 5

[13] R. G. Downey and M. R. Fellows. *Fundamentals of Parameterized Complexity*. Springer, 2013. 4

[14] D. Eppstein and E. S. Spiro. The h-index of a graph and its application to dynamic subgraph statistics. *Journal of Graph Algorithms and Applications*, 16(2):543–567, 2012. 19

[15] P. Erdős and T. Gallai. Graphs with prescribed degrees of vertices (in Hungarian). *Math. Lapok*, 11:264–274, 1960. 20

[16] M. R. Fellows. Blow-ups, win/win's, and crown rules: Some new directions in FPT. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Workshop on Graph-Theoretic Conecpts in Computer Science (WG '03)*, volume 2880 of *LNCS*, pages 1–12. Springer, 2003. 3

[17] M. R. Fellows, J. Guo, H. Moser, and R. Niedermeier. A generalization of Nemhauser and Trotter's local optimization theorem. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 77(6):1141–1158, 2011. 3

[18] J. Flum and M. Grohe. *Parameterized Complexity Theory*. Springer, 2006. 4

[19] M. R. Garey and D. S. Johnson. *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*. Freeman, 1979. 5

[20] P. A. Golovach. Editing to a connected graph of given degrees. *CoRR*, abs/1308.1802, 2013. 3

[21] J. Guo and R. Niedermeier. Invitation to data reduction and problem kernelization. *SIGACT News*, 38(1):31–45, 2007. 4

[22] P. L. Hammer and B. Simeone. The splittance of a graph. *Combinatorica*, 1(3):275–284, 1981. 20

[23] P. L. Hammer, T. Ibaraki, and B. Simeone. Degree sequences of threshold graphs. *Congressus Numerantium*, 21:329–355, 1975. 20

[24] S. Hartung, A. Nichterlein, R. Niedermeier, and O. Suchý. A refined complexity analysis of degree anonymization on graphs. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP '13)*, volume 7966 of *LNCS*, pages 594–606. Springer,

2013. Journal version to appear in *Information and Computation*. 2, 3, 12, 19, 20

[25] S. Hartung, C. Hoffmann, and A. Nichterlein. Improved upper and lower bound heuristics for degree anonymization in social networks. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Symposium on Experimental Algorithms (SEA '14)*, 2014. Accepted for publication. 2, 20

[26] P. Katerinis and N. Tsikopoulos. Minimum degree and f-factors in graphs. *New Zealand Journal of Mathematics*, 29(1):33–40, 2000. 12, 13

[27] D. J. Kleitman and S. Y. Li. A note on unigraphic sequences. *Studies in Applied Mathematics*, 4:283–287, 1975. 20

[28] C. Komusiewicz and R. Niedermeier. New races in parameterized algorithmics. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science (MFCS '12)*, volume 7464 of *LNCS*, pages 19–30. Springer, 2012. 3, 18

[29] D. Lokshtanov, N. Misra, and S. Saurabh. Kernelization - preprocessing with a guarantee. In *The Multivariate Algorithmic Revolution and Beyond*, pages 129–161, 2012. 4

[30] L. Lovász and M. D. Plummer. *Matching Theory*, volume 29 of *Annals of Discrete Mathematics*. North-Holland, 1986. 13

[31] F. Maffray and M. Preissmann. Linear recognition of pseudo-split graphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 52(3):307–312, 1994. 20

[32] L. Mathieson and S. Szeider. Editing graphs to satisfy degree constraints: A parameterized approach. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 78(1):179–191, 2012. 2, 3, 4, 5

[33] H. Moser and D. M. Thilikos. Parameterized complexity of finding regular induced subgraphs. *Journal of Discrete Algorithms*, 7(2):181–190, 2009. 3

[34] A. Natanzon, R. Shamir, and R. Sharan. Complexity classification of some edge modification problems. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 113: 109–128, 2001. 20

[35] R. Niedermeier. *Invitation to Fixed-Parameter Algorithms*. Oxford University Press, 2006. 4